

REMARKS

The above amendments to the above-captioned application along with the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 1, 2009 (U.S. Patent Office Paper No. 20090825). In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to give due reconsideration to this application, to indicate the allowability of the claims, and to pass this case to issue.

Status of the Claims

As outlined above, claims 11-35 stand for consideration in this application, wherein claims 11 and 23 are being amended to improve form. All amendments to the application are fully supported therein. For example, the amendments to the claims are supported by paragraphs [0044-53] and [0061-75], as well as by Figures 4, 5, 7, 9, 11A, and 11B, of the application as originally filed. Applicants hereby submit that no new matter is being introduced into the application through the submission of this response.

Formality Rejections

Claims 11 and 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. As set forth above, claims 11 and 23 are being amended to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectively submit that the present invention as claimed is definite and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 11-13, 19-21, 23-25, and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moroto (U.S. Patent No. 5,121,326) in view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. Claims 14-18 and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moroto in view of Katou (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,161). Claims 22, 34 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moroto in view of Nakayama (U.S. Patent No. 5,732,385). Applicants have reviewed the above-noted rejections, and hereby respectfully traverse.

As outlined above, claims 11-35 remain of record. A proper obviousness rejection requires establishing that the prior art references, when combined, teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. MPEP §2143. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Moroto,

either alone or in combination with Katou, Nakayama, and/or the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, fails to show each and every limitation of claims 11-35.

For example, none of the cited references teaches or suggests that “the number of objects or occupied area ratio displayed is changed in accordance with the running speed of the vehicle by using the changing priorities,” as required by independent claim 11. Rather, Moroto contrastingly provides display system in a navigation apparatus in which the scale ratio of a displayed map is “set in conformity with distance between a present position and a destination, and roads are selectively displayed on a display unit [] in conformity with the scale ratio.” (Abstract; col. 2, ll. 50-54). A display map in which the display is scaled and roads are selectively displayed based on a distance to a destination, as described in Moroto, is clearly not a summarized map in which the number of objects or occupied area ratio displayed is changed in accordance with the running speed of the vehicle by using the changing priorities for roads that are set in accordance with a change in a guide route, as required by claim 11.

Furthermore, Katou and Nakayama also each fail to teach or suggest that “the number of objects or occupied area ratio displayed is changed in accordance with the running speed of the vehicle by using the changing priorities,” as required by claim 11. Katou merely describes a land vehicle navigation apparatus that includes “a display monitor unit for displaying a guidance screen with a map and other information relating to the route search and route guidance in a one-screen mode, or in a multiple-screen mode” and a display controller that a “schematic diagram screen on the one screen when the vehicle is traveling on a highway or expressway. Alternatively, the display controller displays [an] architectural structure shape map screen on the one screen when the vehicle is traveling within towns or cities. Where a characteristic object of interest is present ahead of the present position, the display controller operates to display a screen containing information relating to the characteristic object.” (Abstract; col. 2, ll. 44-53). A multi-screen guidance map upon which the type of map displayed is based on the type of road or region is vehicle is traveling on, as provided in Katou, is clearly not a summarized map in which the number of objects or occupied area ratio displayed is changed in accordance with the running speed of the vehicle by using the changing priorities for roads that are set in accordance with a change in a guide route, as required by claim 11.

Nakayama simply describes a vehicle navigation system that provides various birds-eye view road maps of different visual points and different contraction scale ratios “formed according to vehicle travel speed or according to a distance from the current vehicle position

to the nearest specific traffic point (e.g., intersection); that is, various birds-eye view road maps obtained from a suitable visual point and in a suitable contraction scale ratio can be displayed at all times according to the vehicle travel conditions.” (Abstract). Nakayama explains that “the vehicle speed is, the broader will be the road map range; or the lower the vehicle speed is, the narrower will be the road map range, so that the more detail road map near the current vehicle position can be displayed at low vehicle speed.” (Col. 13, ll. 32-35). That is, Nakayama merely provides that a display range for a road map is set according the vehicle speed. A display map having a **display range** that is based on the speed of a vehicle as provided in Katou, however, is clearly not a summarized map in which **the number of objects or occupied area ratio displayed** is changed based on a running speed of a vehicle **by using the changing priorities** for roads that are set in accordance with a change in a guide route, as required by claim 11.

For at least these reasons, each of the Nakayama, Akimoto, and Katou references fails to teach or suggest that “the number of objects or occupied area ratio displayed is changed in accordance with the running speed of the vehicle by using the changing priorities” as required by claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Moroto, either alone or in combination with Katou, Nakayama, and/or the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 11, and that claim 11 is now in condition for allowance.

For at least similar reasons to those discussed above with reference to claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references teaches or suggests the similar limitation required by claim 23 of “changing the number of objects or occupied area ratio displayed in accordance with the running speed of the vehicle by using the changing priorities,” and that claim 23 is therefore also now in condition for allowance.

Where an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 5 U.P.S.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Because Moroto, either alone or in combination with Katou, Nakayama, and/or the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each and every limitation of claims 11 and 23, and because claims 12-22 and claims 24-35 depend either directly or indirectly from claims 11 and 23 respectively, Applicants respectfully submit that Moroto, either alone or in combination with Katou, Nakayama, and/or the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, does not render obvious claims 12-22 and claims 24-35 for at least the reasons set forth above that the references do not render obvious

claims 11 and 23 respectively, and that claims 12-22 and 24-35 are also now in condition for allowance.

Therefore, Applicants respectively submit that the present invention as claimed is distinguishable and thereby allowable over the prior art of record.

Conclusion

In view of all the above, Applicants respectfully submit that certain clear and distinct differences as discussed exist between the present invention as now claimed and the prior art references upon which the rejections in the Office Action rely. These differences are more than sufficient that the present invention as now claimed would not have been anticipated nor rendered obvious given the prior art. Rather, the present invention as a whole is distinguishable, and thereby allowable over the prior art.

Favorable reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding issues requiring discussion that would further the prosecution and allowance of the above-captioned application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the address and phone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Nicholas B. Trenkle
Registration Number 54,500



Juan Carlos A. Marquez
Registration Number 34,072

STITES & HARBISON, PLLC
1199 North Fairfax Street
Suite 900
Alexandria, VA 22314-1437
(703) 739-4900 Voice
(703) 739-9577 Fax
Customer No. 38327
December 1, 2009

156150:1:ALEXANDRIA